

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MICHAEL PAPPAS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 08-11490  
Hon. Lawrence P. Zatkoff

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's *pro per* "response to Defendant's motion for summary judgment fo [sic] summary judgment case reconsideration request" [dkt 43]. On December 8, 2009, the Court granted Defendant's motion for summary judgment and dismissed Plaintiff's complaint. On July 19, 2011, Plaintiff filed his present motion, in which he asks the Court to reconsider its opinion and order granting Defendant's motion for summary judgment based on evidence discovered during the past year-and-a-half in other litigation. Since Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its prior opinion and order, the Court will construe Plaintiff's motion, which is devoid of any reference to legal authority, as one for reconsideration. Pursuant to E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(h)(2), no response is permitted. The Court finds that the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented in Plaintiff's papers such that the decision process would not be significantly aided by oral argument. Therefore, pursuant to E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(f)(2), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion be resolved on the brief submitted. For the reasons set forth below, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

Local Rule 7.1(h)(1) governs motions for reconsideration, and states that such motions must

be filed within 14 days after entry of the judgment or order. Since Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration was filed over a year-and-a-half after the order and entry of judgment, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is untimely. Even were the Court to construe Plaintiff's motion as one for relief from judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), such motions must be brought within one year after the entry of judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion also cannot be granted under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Having failed to provide the Court with legal authority that would allow it to grant Plaintiff's requested relief, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion [dkt 43] is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**S/Lawrence P. Zatkoff**

**LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**Dated: August 26, 2011**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

**The undersigned certifies that a copy of this Order was served upon the attorneys of record by electronic or U.S. mail on August 26, 2011.**

**S/Marie E. Verlinde**

**Case Manager**

**(810) 984-3290**